

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 10, 2008, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (hereinafter "the Office") made no further mentioning of the rejections of Claims 1, 28, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and applicants considered these rejections withdrawn. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-16, 18-21, 23-26, 28-31, 33, 34, 36-43, 45-48, 50-53, 55, 59-61, and 64-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,977, issued to Thro et al. (hereinafter "Thro et al."), and further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624, issued to Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter "Jamtgaard et al."). Claims 5, 17, 22, 27, 32, 44, 49, and 54 were rejected in view of the teachings of Jamtgaard et al., Thro et al., and further in view of the teachings of "Adapting Content for VoiceXML" by Didier Martin (<http://web.archive.org/web/20010330041531/http://www.xml.com/pub/a/2000/08/23/didier/index.html>) (hereinafter "Martin"). Claims 8 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Jamtgaard et al. and Thro et al., and further in view of the teachings of Phone.com, Press Release: "GVC Licenses Phone.com Up.browser Microbrowser for Mobile Phones in Asia Europe."

Without admitting to the propriety of the rejections, applicants have made amendments to clarify Claims 1, 28, 55, 66, 69, 70, and 71. Particularly, applicants are unable to find, and the Office has failed to show where the cited and applied references, alone much less in combination, teach "validating a format of an address of each recipient device from the list of recipient devices and determining a target wireless-device type by an asynchronous process that performs device processing, the asynchronous process marking the address as undeliverable if the format of the address associated with a recipient device is invalid," as recited in Claims 1, 28, 55, 66, 69, 70, and 71, albeit in different manners.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206 682 8100

There are no reasons to combine the references because not all of the claim elements have been taught or suggested by the references. Therefore, the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Because the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejections should be withdrawn. Claims 1, 28, 55, 66, 69, 70, and 71 are allowable independent claims. Claims 2-27, 29-54, 59-61, 64, 65, 67, and 68 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims and because of the additional claim elements added by those claims. Consequently, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D.C. Peter Chu', with a stylized, cursive script.

D.C. Peter Chu  
Registration No. 41,676  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1636

DPC:jljg

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206 682 8100